August 18
1921

THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS'

MILLENNIAL STAR.

[ESTABLISHED 1840].

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, if they reject my words, and this part of my Gospel and ministry, blessed are ye, for they can do no more unto you than unto me" (DOC. AND COV. 6: 29).

No. 33, Vol. LXXXIII. Thursday, August 18, 1921. Price One Penny.

ANSWER GIVEN TO "TEN REASONS WHY 'CHRISTIANS' CAN NOT FELLOWSHIP WITH LATTER-DAY SAINTS."*

BY BRIGHAM H. ROBERTS.

IT IS with some misgivings that I undertake to discharge the duty placed upon me this afternoon in addressing you. I need not tell you that the weather is extremely warm, and doubtless the discomfort of this session may be considerable. I sincerely trust, however, that through your faith and mine, we shall be able to so approach the duty of the hour that we may have a time of rejoicing while contemplating the things of God, and that things which are discomforting may be forgotten.

I have what appears to me to be a very interesting subject, and I hope you will find it so. It grows out of this incident: In *The Deseret News* of Friday evening there was published a document stating ten reasons why certain Christian people cannot fellowship with Latter-day Saints. I understand that the document has been recently issued by the Presbytery of Utah, that it has been indorsed by the Congregational Association of Utah, and also by the Baptist Association of Utah. I say, "recently issued"; I ought to have said re-issued, for I find it in substance to be the re-appearance of the same ten reasons published by the Presbytery of Utah some twenty-five years ago. Perhaps because it is re-issued, and a little changed, accounts for the apparently studied efforts in the document to make "Mormon" principles appear as brutal and offensive as possible.

It is stated that the document is issued through no ill-will towards the Latter-day Saints' Church, as citizens, that it is purely a religious controversy, and no ill-will is intended by

*A discourse delivered in the Salt Lake Tabernacle, July 10th, 1921.

setting forth these ten reasons why Latter-day Saints should not be fellowshipped by Christians; that those who issue it are but performing a duty to themselves and to Christian people everywhere, because these are matters of universal concern. Well, I take that at its full face value, and am quite willing to believe that these associations bear us no ill-will; that they are merely discharging what they consider to be their duty as Christians, and in vindication of which they believe to be true Christian principles; and would vindicate God against what they consider the viciousness of our doctrines. I hope that in such discussions of these matters, as I shall give on this occasion, I shall perform my duty as an elder of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in a becoming and Christian spirit; and certainly I bear those whose ideas I undertake, in part at least, to refute, no ill-will. I accept them as fellow-citizens of our common country, and also as children of our God in whom our Father in Heaven is profoundly interested, and is just as anxious for their salvation as he is for ours, and that they have as much claim upon his mercy and goodness as we have, and that in the restoration of the Gospel of Jesus Christ the Lord has had in view the salvation of all people and all races of men so far as they will obey, from the heart, those doctrines and ordinances of the Gospel which are essential to salvation.

One other reason impels me to the consideration of these "Ten Reasons," and that is since they are published to the world, issued in tract form, as I understand it, by the associations named as sponsors for them, and re-produced in our own Church newspaper, I think that something is due in the way of explanation and defense to the youth of our people, that they should understand how far in these "Ten Reasons" we are misrepresented, and how far they may state the truth concerning our faith and doctrine.

Two things I think should be considered with reference to this document before proceeding to the discussion of it:

First, the apparent effort to state supposed "Mormon" doctrine in as offensive terms as possible, the desire being to make said doctrine obnoxious; and second, there should be some means of determining what "Mormon" doctrine is—just what the "Mormon" Church stands responsible for before the public opinion of mankind.

As to the first, I have already called attention to the fact that the "Ten Reasons" is a re-issue of an old tract published nearly a quarter of a century ago. At that time, it will be remembered that, as a Church, we were passing through a period of very bitter opposition, political as well as religious; and the opponents to our Church were seeking then to hold it up to ridicule and scorn; and to achieve this end they presented our alleged doctrines in the most offensive terms that could be employed. I think it un-

fortunate that this same phraseology is now employed, when all are in calmer mood, and there is no occasion for studied offensiveness.

As to the second observation, the need of ascertaining some rule or guide for determining what "Mormon" doctrine is, that is very important, for I am very sure that the Church of the Latter-day Saints is not responsible for all that is alleged against her as to doctrine by her critics. She is not responsible for all that is alleged against her as to doctrine in these "Ten Reasons" under consideration.

I have written out here some notes from a very interesting discussion that was carried on about one hundred years ago between Robert Southey, then poet laureate of England, who in a two-volume work called "The Church's Own Book," meaning by that the record of the Roman Catholic Church in great Britain, undertook to inveigh against the position of the Catholic Church. He was answered by a Mr. Charles Butler, a very learned man in the law and a very fine controversialist. In answering the poet laureate, Mr. Butler laid down these principles of discussion which I think exceeding good, and largely applicable in the present case.

"I willingly admit," said he, "that to produce against our creed or conduct all that research or fair argument can supply, is legitimate controversy; but surely to conceal our merits, or to represent them very briefly and imperfectly, and to display our defects at length, and with the highest colouring; to impute to our general body what in justice is only chargeable on individuals; or to estimate the writings or actions of our ancestors in the dark ages by the notions and manners of the present age, is a crying injustice."

That is from his preface. Further on he said:

"On all I beg leave to suggest, that in every religious controversy between Protestants and Roman Catholics, the following rule should be rigidly observed:

"That no doctrine should be ascribed to the Roman Catholics, as a body, except such as is an article of their faith. Among the many misconceptions of their faith, of which the Roman Catholics have to complain, they feel none more than those which proceed from a want of the observance of this rule. It is most true, that the Roman Catholics believe the doctrines of their Church to be unchangeable; and that it is a tenet of their creed that what their faith ever has been, such it was from the beginning, such it now is, and such it ever will be. But this proposition they confine to the articles of their faith; and they consider no doctrine to be of faith unless it has been delivered by divine revelation, and propounded by the Roman Catholic Church, as a revealed article of faith. This the Roman Catholics wish their adversaries never to forget."

If you will just write "Mormon" instead of "Roman Catholic" in that statement, it will represent our insistence precisely in matters of controversy.

"When any of their adversaries," Mr. Butler continues, "find in any Catholic writer a position which they think reprehensible, they should inquire whether it be an article of Catholic faith or an opinion of a writer. In the latter case they should reflect that the general body of the Catholics is not responsible for it, and should, therefore, abstain from charging it upon the body. And if they [Roman Catholic adversaries] take the higher ground, they should first endeavor to ascertain that it is an article of the Catholic faith. But here again they should carefully examine whether it be the principle itself, which they mean to impute to the Catholics, or a consequence which they themselves reduce from it; these are widely different, and should never be confounded. If it be the principle, they should then inquire, whether it has been propounded as an article of faith by the Church. 'Whatever other opinions can be adduced' (i.e., outside of doctrine propounded by the Church) 'though they be the opinions of their most respectable writers, though they be the opinions of the fathers of their church, still they are but matters of opinion, and a Catholic may disbelieve them, without ceasing to be a Catholic.'"

Now, I say again, that those are the principles that should be adhered to in controversy with us. These are the principles I shall insist upon in the present discussion.

Here is a statement to which I call your attention. You will find it published in a little work called, "The Compendium of the Doctrines of the Gospel," issued by Messrs. Little and Richards, the authors. I quote from the third edition, 1898:

"We consider the Bible, Book of Mormon, Book of Doctrine and Covenants, Pearl of Great Price, and sayings of Joseph the Seer, our guides in faith and doctrine. The first four have been adopted as such by a vote of the saints in general conference. References to other writings are only for illustration of the subjects."

As to the "sayings of Joseph Smith," they must be well attested sayings of his, not the mere repetition of rumor as to what he said, before they can be of much influence in doctrine. Indeed, I feel that the Church has confined the sources of doctrine by which it is willing to be bound before the world to the things that God has revealed, and which the Church has officially accepted, and those alone. These would include the Bible, the Book of Mormon, the Doctrine and Covenants, the Pearl of Great Price; these have been repeatedly accepted and endorsed by the Church in general conference assembled, and are the only sources of absolute appeal for our doctrine. So that when our Church is charged with believing this or that or the other thing we shall

ask, Do you quote in support of your charges these sources of revelation which we accept as setting forth our doctrine? And is it a doctrine of ours or a deduction of your own?

If it is a doctrine of ours established as here proposed, we must stand for it. If you bring up the sayings and teachings of individual men who have not had their doctrines officially accepted by the Church, decidedly by the spirit of inspiration in the membership of the Church, as evidenced by their official acceptance of them, then we are not bound by them, and it is not accurate to say that the Church teaches those doctrines which do not come from the above-noted sources of revelation to the Church.

In our articles of faith which have been repeatedly accepted by vote of the Church in general conference assembled, as matters most assuredly believed by the Church, we say:

"We believe the Bible to be the word of God, as far as it is translated correctly; we also believe the Book of Mormon to be the word of God."

This fixes the status of the Bible and the Book of Mormon as sources of authority on doctrine among us. As to the book of Doctrine and Covenants and the Pearl of Great Price, I give the following account of the official action of the Church, with accompanying explanations, from minutes of the general conferences referred to:

At the fiftieth semi-annual conference, held Sunday, October 10th, 1880, President George Q. Cannon said: "I hold in my hand the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, and also the book, The Pearl of Great Price, which books contain revelations of God. In Kirtland, the Doctrine and Covenants in its original form, as first printed, was submitted to the officers of the Church to vote upon. As there have been additions made to it by the publishing of revelations which were not contained in the original edition, it has been deemed wise to submit these books with their contents to the conference to see whether the conference will vote to accept the books and their contents as from God, and binding on us as a people and as a Church."

President Joseph F. Smith said: "I move that we receive and accept the revelations contained in these books as revelations of God to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and to all the world."—(From Minutes of the Conference, *Millennial Star*, Vol. 42, p. 724).

It will be observed that President Joseph F. Smith moved to "receive and accept the revelations contained in these books." The motion was couched in those words because there was in the Doctrine and Covenants some matter that did not purport to be revelations, such as the Lectures on Faith, and hence by limiting the acceptance of the "revelations contained in these books," those parts not comprising the revelations were not included in the vote of acceptance, and as binding on the Church.

At the seventy-third semi-annual conference, held Monday, October 6th, 1902, President Joseph F. Smith said: "I hold in my hand a copy of the revised edition of the Pearl of Great Price. The Pearl of Great Price, as it originally existed, was presented before the general conference and accepted as one of the standard works of the Church. Since then the book has undergone a revision; that is to say, all the revelations that it formerly contained which were also in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, have been eliminated from it, as we thought it unnecessary to have revelations published in this book which were already published in the Doctrine and Covenants; therefore, these revelations have been eliminated from the Pearl of Great Price as it now is, and you will find them in the Doctrine and Covenants. In addition to this, Prof. James E. Talmage has gone through the work and divided it into chapters and verses, making it a far more convenient book for reference than it was before. He has also supplied copious footnotes or references, which will be an aid in the study of the book. These are the changes that have been made in the book, and we now present this book in its revised form—the original matter being preserved as it was before, only divided into chapters and verses—for your acceptance as a standard work of the Church."

It was moved and seconded that the book be accepted as a standard work of the Church, and the motion was carried unanimously. (From Minutes of the General Conference Report, 1902, page 83).

This, then, represents the position of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints upon the authoritative sources of their doctrine. It is not sufficient to quote sayings purported to come from Joseph Smith or Brigham Young upon matters of doctrine. Our own people also need instruction and correction in respect of this. It is common to hear some of our older brethren say, "But I heard Brother Joseph myself say so," or "Brother Brigham preached it; I heard him." But that is not the question. The question is has God said it? Was the prophet speaking officially, what the Catholics would call excathedra?

In his journal, under date of January the 8th, 1843, the prophet writes: "This morning I read German, and visited with a brother and sister from Michigan, who thought that a prophet is always a prophet," but I told them that a prophet was a prophet only when he was acting as such." That is to say, when acting officially and delivering the word and will of God—speaking excathedra.

As to the printed discourses of even leading brethren, the same principle holds. They do not constitute the court of ultimate appeal on doctrine. They may be very useful in the way of elucidation and are very generally good and sound in doctrine, but they are not the ultimate sources of the doctrines of the

Church, and are not binding upon the Church. The rule in that respect is: What God has spoken, and what has been accepted by the Church as the word of God, by that, and that only, are we bound in doctrine. When in the revelations it is said concerning the Prophet, Seer and Revelator that the Church shall "give heed unto all his words and commandments which he shall give unto you as he receiveth them—for his word ye shall receive as if from mine own mouth, in all patience and faith"—(Doctrine and Covenants, Section 21)—it is understood, of course, that this has reference to the word of God received through revelation, and officially announced to the Church, and not to every chance word spoken. And when it is further said, as it is in one of the revelations, that whatsoever the elders of the Church "shall speak when moved upon by the Holy Ghost, shall be the mind of the Lord and shall be the word of the Lord, shall be the voice of the Lord and the power of God unto salvation"—it is to be precisely noted that this is "when" the elders "speak as moved upon by the Holy Ghost," and not otherwise; and as the elders do not always speak as moved upon by the Holy Ghost, the Church does not admit their utterances as on the same level for deciding upon Church doctrine as the four books that have been mentioned.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

THE BOOK.

A worn old book of ages gone I found,
All gray with dust, in dingy cover bound.
I opened it to read its ancient lay,
And find the soul of some forgotten day.
But when upon a page my vision fell
I read not, because thereupon did dwell
A four leaf clover, brown and crisp with years.
Its sentiment bestirred my heart to tears.
I tried to pick it off, but there it clung
Like some small fancy in a memory hung.
Above, I saw the name, "Lord Lyttleton,"
And read these words, which then my vision won:
"None without hope e'er loved the brightest fair,
But love can hope, where reason would despair."

A worn old book, but there upon its page
I found that saying of some worthy sage.
Tho' closed again and back upon the shelf.
That book's strange message brought me to myself.

HELEN EMMA MARING.

THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS' MILLENNIAL STAR.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 18, 1921.

EDITORIAL:

COMPELLING SITUATIONS.

A FORMER article in these pages dealt with the two-fold character of God's dealings with man, as evidenced in the mighty work of preparation now in progress for the glorious coming of the Lord. The Saviour made plain this divine program when he delivered to his former-day disciples the parable in which the kingdom of heaven is likened unto a feast:

A certain man made a great supper and bade many:

And sent his servant at supper time to say to them that were bidden, Come; for all things are now ready.

And they all with one consent began to make excuse. The first said unto him, I have bought a piece of ground, and I must needs go and see it: I pray thee have me excused.

And another said, I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I go to prove them: I pray thee have me excused.

And another said, I have married a wife, and therefore I cannot come. So that servant came, and shewed his lord these things. Then the master of the house being angry said to his servant, Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor, and the maimed, and the halt and the blind.

And the servant said, Lord, it is done as thou hast commanded and yet there is room.

And the Lord said unto the servant, Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in, that my house may be filled.

For I say unto you, That none of those men which were bidden shall taste of my supper.

"Compel?" Yes—so it is written; such is the letter of the Scripture. But let us interpret the dead letter by the living Spirit. God will not compel men to come into his kingdom—not in the sense of fettering the free human will; for that would be contrary to the spirit and genius of the Gospel. It would savour of the doctrine of Lucifer, who sought to destroy the agency of man. God will force no man to heaven, nor permit Satan to force any man into hell. Human agency must remain inviolate. But the Lord has never said that he would not create compelling situations, causing conditions and circumstances to arise which, under the divine overruling, frequently induce men to do, of their own volition, what they would not have done if such conditions and circumstances had not arisen.

When I was a lad at school, I studied my spelling lesson out of a

book in which were a number of pictures, one of them of a well-to-do farmer or fruit-raiser, holding an altercation with a boy who, without leave, had climbed into one of his apple trees and was devouring the ripe and luscious fruit. "Come down," says the farmer kindly. But the boy refuses to obey. Then the farmer, righteously angry, speaks sharply, demanding that he descend; and, to enforce the demand, throws a handful of turf at the impudent and defiant urchin. Still he refuses to comply, and goes on eating the stolen fruit, laughing and jeering in the face of the irate owner of the orchard. Now the latter becomes terribly in earnest. Picking up some rocks, he gives the young thief a good pelting, with the result that he scrambles down in a hurry—of his own accord.

"Compelled?" Yes, but not in a way to interfere with his agency. He could have remained in the apple tree indefinitely, had he felt so inclined. But he no longer desired to remain there. He had changed his mind; he wanted to come down—and came.

That is my idea of a compelling situation. That simple story illustrates the manner in which the All-wise is dealing with this sinful and rebellious world. He will not use force, directly, to influence a choice between good and evil. But he will employ it in such a way as to humble man's pride and make him more receptive of the truth. Compulsion of that kind is undoubtedly an element of the divine economy.

God is not trying to damn the world; he is trying to save it. And save it he will, by every means at his command—and that, too, without taking from men their agency or right of choice, the inalienable heritage of every son and daughter of Deity. Each has it in his power to decide whether he will yield obedience to the Gospel, as proclaimed by the humble servants of the Lord sent forth to sound a timely warning to the nations, or wait until the judgments of the Almighty shake the earth and cause the starry heavens to tremble.

O. F. W.

THE TELLTALE LINES.

"He is the kind of man who does his drinking in secret and his reeling in public—but he doesen't fool anyone but himself," commented the man who had been questioned concerning a certain character. But the man went reeling on, entirely oblivious of the fact that he had revealed his actions and habits quite as plainly as if he had advertised his intentions and then brought his bottle into the public square.

He fooled nobody but himself!

Those who saw him when he did not reel, could read his face. The lines of the face show as much as the lines of the hands—and they are plainly read by all.

You can behave according to one code of ethics during the week, and then profess faith in another code on Sunday, persuading yourself that you are fooling people. The chances are that you succeed in misleading someone—but that one is yourself and none other.

The butcher who short-weights, the grocer who short-changes his customers, the merchant who misrepresents his goods, the lawyer who double-crosses his clients, the farm hand who shirks his chores, and the man in the factory who tries to mislead his foreman, are all in the same class. But every thief robs himself most of all. The scars of dishonest dealing are bound to cut deep on their characters and reflect truly in their faces.

With persistent misbehavior and long-practiced cheating, the conscience may be hardened so that it refuses to function—but the fox-like expression of cupidity and cunning will mirror debasement in the lines of the face, disclosing the thoughts in the heart of the persistent malefactor.

What a silly, pitiful creature is the self-deceived man who thinks he can continue in the wrong way and conceal all trace of his hypocricy from the world! He fools no one but himself.—*Dearborn Independent.*

WERE THE BRASS PLATES WRITTEN IN EGYPTIAN?

By Thomas W. Brookbank.

In the remarks under the caption "Concerning the Brass Plates," brief references were made to the claim that the plates carried away by Lehi from Jerusalem were engraved in Egyptian hieroglyphics. Those who have received a convincing testimony from the Lord that "Mormonism," so-called, is true, do not need evidence that bears on this particular matter to give them an abiding assurance that the Egyptian was used as stated; yet there are some of the less experienced members of the Church, and investigators in general, who will be glad to know what logical reasons, if any, can be produced to sustain the Book of Mormon statement in the case, and to supply a number of such reasons is the work now in hand.

The proposition that some or, perhaps, a large majority of the Israelites learned the Egyptian while in bondage to the Pharaohs during the two hundred and fifteen years of actual servitude under them, is scouted by many of the opponents of this work on the ground that, since the Israelites generally regarded the Hebrew as the language used in the Garden of Eden, and, consequently, invested with a certain degree of sacredness, not one of them would have honored their Egyptian oppressors by adopting their language.

Well, two hundred and fifteen years is a long time for a people to live in the midst of a foreign nation without getting quite

familiar with the speech of the latter, and especially is this the true case where the one people is in bondage to the other; for under such circumstances the question whether or not those in servitude are going to honor their oppressors is one that the slave drivers always settle themselves in a summary manner according to their own way of thinking. The masters decide whose will, wishes and convenience are to be observed and held sacred. The relationship which existed between the enslaved Israelites and their Egyptian oppressors makes it logically certain that there was established, in some way, a ready means of communication for business needs; and it is unbelievable that for more than two centuries the Egyptians made their wishes and commands known to their slaves through Hebrew interpreters. The Egyptians in general, at that early day, were a hardhearted and cruel people, and who can think that for a couple of centuries they condescended to learn the Hebrew, instead of having the Israelites learn the Egyptian? One or the other of these things had to be done in order, as already stated, that there might be a ready means of communication for the transaction of all business concerns where both parties were interested; and so it is very improbable that any of the Israelites (save little children) who went out of Egypt under the leadership of Moses did not have a fair knowledge of the Egyptian, notwithstanding what some of our opponents say about the contemptuous bearing of the Israelites toward their oppressors.

Thus far these remarks apply only to the Israelites as a community; but coming now to individual cases, we would like to have an explanation as to how Moses, who was brought up as the son of Pharaoh's daughter, got along with his foster mother all the days he lived in her home, if he did not have a knowledge of the Egyptian? Did she always have to speak to him through an interpreter, and when he had something to say to her did she get his meaning in the same round-about way? What fair-minded person can fail to perceive that Moses, the great law-giver and leader of the Israelites, must have had a good understanding of the language of the Egyptians? Is it not probable that Aaron also, who became the spokesman when Moses and he went before Pharaoh to demand the release of the Israelites from bondage, was thoroughly acquainted with the king's language or he could not have acted in the capacity of a fluent speaker when addressing him?

We find, further, that one of Abraham's wives, Hagar, was an Egyptian woman (Genesis 16: 1-4): and Solomon, too, married an Egpytian woman. She was the daughter of one of the Pharaohs, and, under these circumstances, what is more likely than that these two famous Israelites acquired considerable familiarity with the native speech of their respective wives just referred to.

Moreover, Joseph was one hundred and ten years old when he

died in Egypt. He was seventeen when he was sold as a slave by his brothers to Potiphar, one of Pharaoh's officers, and hence was in Egypt ninety-three years. He governed in that land eighty years, and so must have been a slave or servant for thirteen years, during which time, it goes without saying, that his master took care that Joseph did learn the native speech, and this especially in view of the fact that there was then no prospect that Joseph should ever have the least use for any other language. After he attained to a position of power and influence in Egypt, his duties left him no choice but to familiarize himself thoroughly with the language, both spoken and written, of the natives. At the age of thirty Joseph married the daughter of an Egyptian priest, and, considering all the circumstances connected with the life of Joseph, the Egyptian was the speech of that newly-established household. Within four years after his marriage, Manasseh and Ephraim were born—sons of a Hebrew father and an Egyptian mother; and can there be a doubt that in the seclusion of that home the boys used the native speech practically to the exclusion of the Hebrew, if not wholly so? When the children arrived at a proper age to be placed in charge of instructors, their teachers would be natives, for the reason that, save Joseph and his sons, no other Hebrews were then in Egypt, and so the boys would become thoroughly familiar with the Egyptian, both spoken and written, as the sons of the prime minister of the king should be. When Ephraim was about six years old, Jacob, and those of his descendants who were with him, went into Egypt; but as their occupation as shepherds was held in abomination by the Egyptians, the new arrivals were separated from the natives and assigned the land of Goshen for their dwelling place. In view of these facts the sons of Joseph seem to have had but little opportunity to learn the Hebrew through association with their relatives. When Joseph was about fifty-six years of age, and Manasseh and Ephraim not far from twenty-five and twenty-three respectively, Jacob died; but before he passed away he pronounced a blessing upon these two grandsons, as recorded in the 48th chapter of Genesis; and then sent word to his sons and likely to all his *descendants in* Goshen (Gen. 49: 1, 2) that he wanted to hold a special service of prophecy, and acquaint them with what should befall them or their prosperity in the future. When the people arrived in Jacob's presence he proceeded to carry out his purpose, and Joseph's turn coming at last, he heard from his father's lips that astonishing prediction—astonishing it must have seemed to Joseph—which is recorded in Gen. 49: 22-26. When he was told that his "branches should run over the wall," how could he fail to understand that at a time in the future some of his descendants should be separated from other members of the Israelitish community even as a wall separates that which is within its enclosure from that which is without the wall, and

hence, as the separation was symbolized by a wall, that communication between the Israelites who remained in the homeland and those who went somewhere abroad should be cut off. How could he fail to interpret his own prophetic blessings in conjunction with those which Jacob had previously pronounced on the heads of Manasseh and Ephraim his sons, and in particular the blessing given to the latter, who was told that he, in his prosperity, should become a multitude of nations in the midst of the earth (Gen. 48:19)? He would surely know that in the promised land of Canaan a multitude of nations could not possibly be established; and when Joseph was told that his blessings "prevailed above the blessings of his progenitors, even unto the utmost bounds of the everlasting hills," he doubtless saw that the land which should be occupied by his descendents was far larger than Abraham's promised landed possessions, and he would see that symbolic wall grow to the magnitude of a mountain both in height and thickness—barring all communication—and something had to be done in order to meet successfully the extraordinary prospective conditions of life when his posterity came face to face with them as realities, and whether soon comparatively or not until a distant time in the future he may not have known.

Now, can one reasonably assume that those glorious prophecies which Joseph and his sons received at the hands of Jacob were not written down that not one word of them should be forgotten? Their character as a practical covenant which the Almighty had entered into with Joseph and his sons insured that they would be recorded as soon as that work could be done. Recorded then, as they certainly would be, in which of the languages represented by those present at that meeting would the recording be done? There was quite a large family of Hebrews there, all deeply interested in the prophecies which Jacob had just pronounced, a part of them understanding the Hebrew but who were not familiar with the Egyptian, while another part of that family, and *by far the most interested part of it*, did understand the Egyptian thoroughly, but did not have much pratical knowledge of the Hebrew, especially in its written form. These last conclusions are the facts in the matter unless scriptural representations affecting Jacob and his descendants in Egypt at the time involved are to be understood in a light contrary to what they show on their face. And now, in which of the languages represented by Jacob's descendants is it most probable that those prophecies were written? Was the Hebrew to be used that the desire of the people who had the *less* interest in Jacob's utterances might be gratified, or was it the Egpytian that the wishes of those who had the *greater* interest in them might be satisfied? Can one logically think that Manasseh and Eprahaim and that Egyptain mother would crush out of their hearts their natural

desire to have those glorious prophecies recorded in Egyptian, which they all doubtless could read and understand, and be content to have them written in Hebrew only of which at best is apparent they could have had no more than a superficial knowledge? On the contrary, is it not probable that in order to statisfy both parties *one* copy of Jacob's prophecies were written in Hebrew and *another* in Egyptian?

Joseph also was intensely interested in having them preserved in written form. He was powerful and likely rich. He knew that the utterances of his father respecting his posterity had a long time to run before their entire fulfilment could be written into history. In the days of Job lead plates for recording purposes were used, and, later, when the Israelites were in the wilderness, they engraved a gold band to form part of the priestly habiliments, and at the same time brass plates highly polished were used for looking-glasses (Exodus 38: 8). A reading of that same chapter manifests that this metal was abundantly used in the preparation of the Tabernacle furnishings, and it is idle to think that it was then first employed by the Hebrews. The practical knowledge of its use was doubtless handed down to his descendants by Noah, since the beginning of the art of working in brass runs back as far at least as the days of Tubal-cain, whose father was Lamech, who also begat Noah. (Genesis 4: 22, 23, and 5: 28, 29).

In view of these facts there can scarcely arise a question in the mind of any fair-minded person that Joseph knew that metal plates were sometimes used instead of the more destructible materials in common service for recording purposes. He held a high position in the world as the prime minister of the king of Egypt; and so just a bit of natural human pride, if nothing else, would lead him to select something out of the ordinary upon which to record his own extraordinary, prophetic blessings and those of his sons. A plate of lead would seem dull in view of the brilliant record that was to be engraved upon it, and then, too, he would want something more in harmony with the first-class furnishings of his home and his high position in the State. Not to shame himself among the nobles of Egypt, with whom he daily associated, and his own people also, he could not choose common writing material, and so, we think, he chose brass or perhaps gold plates for that first recording of God's revelations, or prophecies, to him, and then did the engraving in the Egyptian characters, since they were the ones with which he, and his wife and sons in particular, were familiar—the latter probably being but little skilled in the Hebrew; the mother likely having still less knowledge of it.

(TO BE CONTINUED).

A GOOD man is one whose goodness is part of himself.

FROM THE MISSION FIELD.

Baptisms.—A baptismal service was held at Cleethorpes Baths, near Grimsby, July 24th, 1921, when three souls were added to the fold of Christ. Elder Francis A. Madsen officiated. The converts were confirmed by President John F. Atterton, Elder Gordon Mathis and Brother Herbert Hall.

On August 7th last, a convert was baptized at Varteg, Bristol conference, by Elder Fred R. Morgan, and confirmed by Elder A. Biggs.

Social.—On August 3rd, 1921, a farewell social was given in the Shildon Branch hall, Newcastle conference, in honor of Sister Lena Sedgwich, who is leaving for Canada. A program consisting of musical numbers, games, and a short address by Elder Charles W. Speierman was enjoyed by all. Refreshments were served. Sister Sedgwich will be greatly missed by the saints of Shildon, as she has taken an active part in that branch for a number of years.

Conferences.—A district conference of the Stroud, Swindon, Bristol and Cheltenham branches was held in Lansdowne Hall, Stroud, July 31st last. There were two sessions and a priesthood meeting. Timely addresses were delivered by Elders Morgan, Thomas, Lockyer, Hansen, Terry, Munk and President Low.

The semi-annual conference of the Lowestoft branch was held Sunday, July 31st, last. At 10 a.m. a priesthood meeting was held, at which the branch officers and missionaries reported their labors and told of the joys they were experiencing in working for the salvation of their fellow-mortals. At the 11 o'clock Sunday-school session an interesting program was carried out. Very creditable work was done by the newly-organized primary class, composed of non-members of the Church, and taught by Madeline Walker. At the 2:30 meeting the general and local authorities were unanimously sustained, and addresses were delivered by President Wm. H. Wilson, Elders Charles D. Barnes, William Walker, and Brother Tuttle. The latter, who had been a religious worker for twenty years, told of his conversion to the faith of the Latter-day Saints, and of the benefits he had derived from it. There were sixty-one present at the evening meeting, nineteen of them non-members of the Church. Gospel discourses were delivered by President Charles Coleby, Elder James Hook, of the Loddon branch, and Elders Tomlinson and Conlam. At the afternoon meeting the elders sang, "School thy feelings," and a mixed chorus rendered, "When the mists have rolled away." At the evening session Elder Conlam and Maggie Walker sang, "Star of the East."

REVENUE FROM SPIRITS.—In a written answer to Mr. Kiley, who asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury the revenue obtained from the duty on spirits for the financial years ending March, 1920 and 1921, and also for the first three months of the present financial year, Mr. Hilton Young says the revenue obtained from spirits for the periods in question is as follows:—Year ended March 31st, 1920, £58,803,000; year ended March 31st, 1921, £71,035,000; three months ended June 30th, 1921, £14,144,000.

"I SHALL NOT CRY RETURN."

I shall not cry Return! Return!
Nor weep my years away;
But just as long as sunsets burn
And dawns make no delay,
I shall be lonesome—I shall miss
Your hand, your voice, your smile, your kiss.

Not often shall I speak your name,
For what would strangers care,
That once a sudden tempest came,
And swept my garden bare,
And then you passed, and in your place
Stood Silence with her lifted face.

Not always shall this parting be,
For though I travel slow,
I, too, may claim eternity
And find the way you go;
And so I do my task and wait
The opening of the outer gate.

ELLEN M. H. GATES.

DIED.

GRIFFITHS.—At Abercarn, Monday July 24th, 1921, Elizabeth Louise Alexander Griffiths. Deceased was baptized December 18th, 1897, by Elder John Lloyd, and confirmed the following day by Elder Charles H. Davies. Funeral services were held July 28th, and were conducted by President D. N. Low and Elder Albert Biggs.

CONTENTS:

Answer Given to "Ten Reasons Why 'Christians' Can Not Fellowship With Latter-day Saints" 513
Poetry: The Book... 519
Editorial: Compelling Situations 520
Were The Brass Plates Written in Egyptian? 522
From the Mission Field 527
Poetry: "I Shall Not Cry Return." 528

EDITED, PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY ORSON F. WHITNEY, 295 EDGE LANE, LIVERPOOL:

FOR SALE IN ALL THE CONFERENCES OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS IN GREAT BRITAIN.